

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-33 and 43-45 remain pending. By this communication, claims 1, 7, 10, 13, 21, 28, 30, and 43 are amended and claim 26 is canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate that claims 10, 13, 28, and 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These claims have been placed in independent form. It is submitted that all pending claims 1-33 and 43-45 are presently allowable, particularly in view of the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8, 14-17, 19-27, 31-33, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over *Gu* (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,988). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Gu discloses a system and method for automated color correction. *Gu* further discloses a preferred configuration that provides a separate target image display connected to a video adapter board associated with a work station in a "dual monitor" approach. *Gu*, col. 9, lines 23-26 and Figure 1. A separate second video monitor is utilized to display a target image on the target image display, that is, a full screen representation of the video image being processed in the system. *Gu*, col. 8, lines 61-64. The configuration allows generation and display of a "spot" or a predetermined region 105 on the second monitor for selection of a particular color region. *Gu*, col. 9, lines 27-30 and Figure 1.

The Office Action appears to read the claimed "contents identifier" on *Gu's* "area of interest 105" or *Gu's* "spot or predetermined region 105" (See Office Action, pg. 11). However, as discussed above, the area of interest 105 is merely a "spot" or some predetermined region that is generated and displayed for the selection of a particular color region. Thus, the area of interest 105 is not the same as the claimed "contents identifier." Having established that *Gu* does not teach the "contents identifier," it can not be fairly concluded that *Gu* teaches or suggests "generating {preference value, reference value, contents identifier} which corresponds to a combination of the preference value, the reference value, and the contents identifier when the reference image has a contents identifier" as recited in amended claim 1 and as similarly recited in amended claims 21 and 43.

Claims 2-8, 14-17, 19-20, 22-27, 31-33, and 44-45 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency on either independent claims 1, 21, or 43, and for the features recited therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to independent claims 1, 21, and 43, and all claims dependent therefrom.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9 and 11 – Gu/Reuman

Claims 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gu* in view of *Reuman* (U.S. Patent No. 6,069,982). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants incorporate the discussion above and submit that *Gu* fails to disclose or suggest all of the features as recited in claim 1, the independent claim from which the rejected claims depend. Further, *Reuman* fails to overcome the

noted deficiencies of *Gu*. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 9 and 11 be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 29 – Gu/Reuman/Pettigrew

Claims 12 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gu* in view of *Reuman* and further in view of *Pettigrew et al.* (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0028736, hereinafter *Pettigrew*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, *Gu* or *Reuman*, alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest all of the features as recited in claims 1 and 21, the independent claims from which the rejected claims depend. Further, *Pettigrew* fails to overcome and are not purported by the Examiner to overcome the noted deficiencies of *Gu* and *Reuman*. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 12 and 29 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 – Gu

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gu*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, *Gu* fails to disclose or suggest all of the features as recited in claim 1, the independent claim from which rejected claim 18 depends. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 18 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Based on at least the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-33 and 43-45 are allowable, and that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request a favorable examination and consideration of the instant application. In the event the instant application can be placed in even better form, Applicants request that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 4, 2008

By: Tremesha S. Willis
Tremesha S. Willis
Registration No. 61830

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620